



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,275	03/12/2001	Kenneth A. Franken	01F1465	8548
24234	7590	05/21/2004	EXAMINER	
SIMMONS, PERRINE, ALBRIGHT & ELLWOOD, P.L.C. THIRD FLOOR TOWER PLACE 22 SOUTH LINN STREET IOWA CITY, IA 52240			SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	10

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/681,275	FRANKEN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dominic D Saltarelli	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyer et al. (6268,849, of record) in view of Stautner et al. (6,172,677) [Stautner].

Regarding claim 1, Boyer discloses an electronic programming guide system (Figure 1, system 8) comprising:

A web browser (col. 6, lines 5-10) on a first PC at a first viewer location (Figure 1, items 70, 72, 74, 76, col. 5, lines 40-44);

A computer system at a second location (Figure 1, web server 55), coupled to said web browser via a computer network (Figure 1, internet 60)

Said web browser displaying a web transmitted guide (col. 5, lines 21-26 and col. 6, lines 1-5) comprising a plurality of cells arranged in rows and columns (Figure 9, col. 8, lines 63-67), wherein said web transmitted guide is transmitted from said second location;

Where each of said plurality of cells is associated with a particular program and contains descriptive text related to said particular program (Figure 9, col. 8 line 67 – col. 9 line 13); and

Where each of said plurality of cells further includes a web browser displayed hypertext link (Figure 9, link 650) which is coupled to software which upon an occurrence of a click on said hypertext link, causes said first PC to receive a video image associated with said particular program (col. 9, lines 55-67, see also col. 5, lines 52-58 and col. 6, lines 5-22).

Boyer fails to disclose receiving said particular program.

In an analogous art, Stautner teaches receiving a particular program (tuning to the channel associated with a selected cell, col. 4, lines 54-60) upon selection of a program cell in an EPG (col. 4, lines 40-60).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Boyer to include receiving said particular program, as taught by Stautner. The reason for doing so is for the desired benefit of allowing a user to control the tuner of the system to tune directly to a chosen program by selecting it from the displayed EPG (Boyer, col. 5, lines 45-58).

Regarding claim 2, Boyer and Stautner disclose the system of claim 1, and further disclose a programming source (Boyer, Figure 1, Media Library 12) which provides video signals (Boyer, col. 4, lines 6-11) over an internet connection (Boyer, Figure 1, internet 60).

Regarding claim 4, Boyer and Stautner disclose the system of claim 2, and further disclose said particular program is displayed on a PC display device (Boyer, Figure 1, integrated PC&TV, col. 5, lines 31-39).

Regarding claim 6, Boyer and Stautner disclose the system of claim 1, and further disclose a PCDTV board disposed in said first PC which tunes video signals (Boyer, Figure 1, integrated PC&TV 78, col. 5, lines 34-37) where said software links said web transmitted guide to said PCDTV board (Boyer, col. 5, lines 52-58).

Regarding claim 7, Boyer and Stautner disclose the system of claim 6, and further disclose said video signals (Boyer, Figure 1, TV signal 80, col. 5, lines 31-39) are displayed on a PC display device (Boyer, Figure 1, integrated PC&TV 78, col. 5, lines 34-37).

Regarding claim 18, Boyer discloses a video delivery system (Figure 1, system 8, col. 3 line 65 – col. 4 line 11 and col. 4, lines 44-48) comprising:

Means (Figure 1, web server 55) for providing a web transmitted television programming guide (col. 5, lines 1-4) for a first PC (Figure 1, PCs 70, 72, 74, 76, col. 5, lines 40-44);

Means for clicking (col. 7, lines 45-53) on a web browser displayed hypertext link in said web transmitted guide (col. 9, lines 61-62); and

Means for delivering video images (col. 5, lines 21-26), in response to said means for clicking (col. 9, lines 61-62) to said viewer on said first PC, such that said video images relate to textual and temporal information included in said web transmitted guide (col. 6, lines 47-67 and col. 9, lines 55-67).

Boyer fails to disclose delivering television programming in response to said clicking that relates to the textual and temporal information included in said web transmitted guide.

In an analogous art, Stautner teaches receiving a particular program (tuning to the channel associated with a selected cell, col. 4, lines 54-60) upon selection of a program cell in an EPG (col. 4, lines 40-60).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Boyer to include delivering television programming in response to clicking that relates to the textual and temporal information included in the guide, as taught by Stautner. The reason for doing so is for the desired benefit of allowing a user to control the tuner of the system to tune directly to a chosen program by selecting it from the displayed EPG (Boyer, col. 5, lines 45-58).

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al. (6,025,837, of record) [Matthews] in view of Boyer and Stautner.

Alternatively, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 18 can also be rejected as an obvious modification of Matthews in view of Boyer and Stautner.

Regarding claim 1, Matthews disclose an electronic programming guide comprising: a browser (106) shown in Figure 4 (col. 8, lines 66-67) on a first PC at a first viewer location (64) shown in Figure 3 (col. 7, lines 47-50), a computer system (22) shown in Figure 3 (col. 7 lines 45-47) at a second location, coupled to said browser (106) via a computer network (74) shown in Figure 4, said browser (106) displaying a guide (104) comprising a plurality of cells arranged in rows and columns (Figure 5), wherein said guide is transmitted from said second location (col. 6, lines 59-62), where each of said plurality of cells is associated with a particular program and contains descriptive text relating to said particular program (also shown in Figure 5) (col. 8, lines 55-63) and, where each of said plurality of cells further includes a hypertext link (140) (col. 9, lines 56-60), which is coupled to software (col. 10, lines 2-3) which upon an occurrence of a click on said hypertext link, causes said first PC (64) to receive a video image associated with said particular program (col. 9, line 56 – col. 10 line 4).

Matthews fail to disclose the browser is a web browser and the guide is a web-transmitted guide, and said clicking causes said first PC to receive said particular program.

In an analogous art, Boyer discloses a web browser (Figure 2, browser 200, col. 2, lines 43-47) for displaying a web-transmitted guide (Figure 9, col. 5, lines 1-3, 21-27), allowing a user to access the guide using commonly available web browser software (col. 1, lines 65-67), removing reliance upon specialized, client side software and equipment (col. 1, lines 45-49).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the electronic programming guide system disclosed by Matthews to include a web browser for displaying a web-transmitted guide, as taught by Boyer, for the benefit of allowing users to access the guide using commonly available web browser software removing reliance upon specialized, client side software and equipment.

In an analogous art, Stautner teaches receiving a particular program (tuning to the channel associated with a selected cell, col. 4, lines 54-60) upon selection of a program cell in an EPG (col. 4, lines 40-60).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Matthews and Boyer to include delivering television programming in response to said clicking of a particular program, as taught by Stautner. The reason for doing so is for the desired benefit of allowing a user to control the tuner of the system to tune directly to a chosen program by selecting it from the displayed EPG (Boyer, col. 5, lines 45-58).

Regarding claim 2, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 1, and additionally disclose a programming source (Matthews, Figure 1, headend 22) which provides video signals over an internet connection, which falls under the definition of networks provided in col. 7, lines 54-63 of Matthews, and where said software links said web transmitted guide to said programming source (Matthews col. 6, lines 59-61, and col. 8, lines 6-11).

Regarding claim 3, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 2, and additionally disclose said particular program to be recorded on said first PC (Matthews Figure 3, PC 64) for subsequent review (Matthews col. 12, lines 26-29, 38-40).

Regarding claim 4, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 2, and additionally disclose said particular program to be displayed on a PC display device (Matthews, Figure 3, PC monitor 66, col. 7, lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 5, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 4, and additionally disclose said particular program is to be recorded on said first PC (Matthews Figure 3, PC 64) for subsequent review (Matthews col. 12, lines 26-29, 38-40).

Regarding claim 6, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 1, and additionally disclose a PCDTV board (Matthews Figure 4, tuner 98), which tunes video signals, where said software links said web transmitted guide to said PCDTV board (Matthews col. 8, lines 27-30, 58-62).

Regarding claim 7, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 6, and additionally disclose said first PC (Matthews, Figure 3, PC 64)

displays video signals on a PC display device (Matthews Figure 3, PC monitor 66, col. 7, lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 8, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 6, and additionally disclose said first PC (Matthews, Figure 3, PC 64) records said video signals for subsequent review (Matthews col. 12, lines 26-29, 38-40).

Regarding claim 9, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 8, and additionally disclose said first PC (Matthews Figure 3, PC 64) displays video signals on a PC display device (Matthews Figure 3, PC monitor 66, col. 7, lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 10, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 9, and additionally disclose said PCDTV board (Matthews Figure 4, tuner 98) receives signals from a broadcast television antenna (Matthews col. 6, lines 7-8, 17-18 and col. 8, lines 24-30).

Regarding claim 11, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 9, and additionally disclose said PCDTV board (Matthews Figure 4, tuner 98) receives signals from a coaxial antenna cable coupled to a source of cable television (Matthews col. 6, lines 7-8, 10-14 and col. 8, lines 24-30).

Regarding claim 12, Matthews disclose a method of delivering television video images to a viewer comprising the steps of providing television programming guide (104) to a first PC (64), clicking on a hypertext link (140) in said guide, and in response to said clicking, delivering video images to said viewer on said first PC (64) (col. 9 line 56 – col. 10 line 4), such that said video images relate to textual and temporal information included in said guide (Figure 5 and col. 9, lines 45-46).

Matthews fail to disclose the guide is web transmitted and the hypertext link is displayed in a web browser, and receiving television programming in response to said clicking.

Boyer discloses a web browser (Figure 2, browser 200, col. 2, lines 43-47), which also includes hypertext links, for displaying a web-transmitted guide (Figure 9, col. 5, lines 1-3, 21-27), allowing a user to access the guide using commonly available web browser software (col. 1, lines 65-67).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Matthews to include a web-transmitted guide and to display the hypertext link in a web browser, as taught by Boyer, for the benefit of allowing users to access the guide using commonly available web browser software.

In an analogous art, Stautner teaches receiving a particular program (tuning to the channel associated with a selected cell, col. 4, lines 54-60) upon selection of a program cell in an EPG (col. 4, lines 40-60).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Matthews and Boyer to include delivering television programming in response to said clicking of a particular program, as taught by Stautner. The reason for doing so is for the desired benefit of allowing a user to control the tuner of the system to tune directly to a chosen program by selecting it from the displayed EPG (Boyer, col. 5, lines 45-58).

Regarding claim 13, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the method of claim 12, and additionally disclose delivering television programming includes delivery of data over an internet connection (Matthews col. 7, lines 64-67 and col. 8, line 1) and generating said television programming using said data (Matthews col. 10, lines 2-3, and col. 12, lines 10-29).

Regarding claim 14, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the method of claim 12, and additionally disclose said step of delivering television programming includes demodulating television signals within said first PC using a PCDTV board (Matthews col. 8, lines 24-30).

Regarding claim 15, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the method of claim 14, and additionally disclose said television signals are received via a broadcast television antenna coupled to said first PC (Matthews col. 6, lines 7-8, 17-18 and col. 8, lines 24-30).

Regarding claim 16, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the method of claim 15, and additionally disclose said step of delivering television programming includes a step of recording said television programming on said first PC (Matthews Figure 3, PC 64) for subsequent review (Matthews col. 12, lines 26-29, 38-40) by the viewer.

Regarding claim 17, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the method of claim 16, and additionally disclose said step of delivering television programming includes delivery of data over an internet connection and generating at least a portion of said television programming using said data (Matthews col. 7, line 54 - col. 8 line 10 and col. 12, lines 8-29).

Regarding claim 18, Matthews disclose a video delivery system comprising means for providing a television programming guide (104) to a first PC (64) (col. 8, lines 55-62), means for clicking (col. 7, lines 45-53) on a hypertext link (140) in said guide (col. 9, lines 55-60), and means for delivering video images (Figure 3, network #2 82) in response to said means for clicking

(col. 7, lines 45-50) to said viewer on said first PC (64), such that said video images relate to textual and temporal information include in said guide (Figure 5, col. 9, line 45 – col. 10 line 4).

Matthews fail to disclose the guide is web transmitted and the hypertext link is displayed in a web browser, and delivering television programming in response to said clicking that relates to the textual and temporal information included in said guide.

Boyer discloses a web browser (Figure 2, browser 200, col. 2, lines 43-47), which also includes hypertext links, for displaying a web-transmitted guide (Figure 9, col. 5, lines 1-3, 21-27), allowing a user to access the guide using commonly available web browser software (col. 1, lines 65-67).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Matthews to include a web-transmitted guide and to display the hypertext link in a web browser, as taught by Boyer, for the benefit of allowing users to access the guide using commonly available web browser software.

In an analogous art, Stautner teaches receiving a particular program (tuning to the channel associated with a selected cell, col. 4, lines 54-60) upon selection of a program cell in an EPG (col. 4, lines 40-60).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Matthews and Boyer to include delivering television programming in response to clicking that relates to the textual and

temporal information included in the guide, as taught by Stautner. The reason for doing so is for the desired benefit of allowing a user to control the tuner of the system to tune directly to a chosen program by selecting it from the displayed EPG (Boyer, col. 5, lines 45-58).

Regarding claim 19, Matthews, Boyer, and Stautner disclose the system of claim 18, and additionally disclose means (Matthews, Figure 4, tuner 98 processor 92) for demodulating a television signal received in said first PC (Matthews Figure 3, PC 64) via a broadcast antenna (Matthews col. 6, lines 7-8, 17-18, and col. 8, lines 24-30), and means (Matthews, Figure 3, network #2 82) for delivery of data over an internet connection and generating said television programming using said data (an inherent feature, because the guide is web based, and because clicking on a hyperlink in a web based guide is to invoke a remote resource, and the act of clicking controls the tuner of the system, the command represented by the hyperlink to control the tuner is a remote resource which must be sent to the system over the internet when the hyperlink is clicked).

4. Claim 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Cathey et al. (5,778,182, of record) [Cathey], Boyer, and Stautner.

Regarding claim 20, Matthews disclose a browser (106) shown in Figure 4 (col. 8, lines 66-67) on a first PC at a first viewer location (64) shown in Figure 3 (col. 7, lines 47-50), a computer system (22) shown in Figure 3 (col. 7 lines 45-

47) at a second location, coupled to said browser (106) via a computer network (74) shown in Figure 4, said browser (106) displaying a guide (104) comprising a plurality of cells arranged in rows and columns (Figure 5), wherein said guide is transmitted from said second location (col. 6, lines 59-62), where each of said plurality of cells is associated with a particular program and contains descriptive text relating to said particular program (also shown in Figure 5) (col. 8, lines 55-63) and, where each of said plurality of cells further includes a hypertext link (140) (col. 9, lines 56-60), which is coupled to software (col. 10, lines 2-3) which upon an occurrence of a click on said hypertext link, causes said first PC (64) to receive a video image associated with said particular program (col. 9 line 56 – col. 10 line 4), a programming source (22) which provides video signals over an internet connection, which falls under the definition of networks provided in col. 7, lines 54-63, and where said software links said guide to said programming source (col. 6, lines 59-61, and col. 8, lines 6-11), wherein a particular program is recorded on said first PC (64) for subsequent review (col. 12, lines 26-29, 38-40), a PCDTV board (98) shown in Figure 4, which tunes video signals, where said software links said guide to said PCDTV board (col. 8, lines 27-30, 58-62), wherein said PCDTV board (98) receives signals from a broadcast television antenna (col. 6, lines 7-8, 17-18 and col. 8, lines 24-30). Matthews specify that the programming source can be delivered in a combination of wired and wireless technologies (col. 6, lines 19-21), accommodating said software to link the guide

to both the program source provided through the internet and to the PCDTV board (98) which receives signals from a broadcast antenna.

Matthews fails to disclose software coupled to said browser for reporting viewing choices made by a user, so that television ratings and consumer research can be facilitated, the browser is a web browser, the guide is a web transmitted guide, and the hypertext link is displayed in a web browser, and said first PC displays a particular program upon clicking the corresponding hypertext link.

Cathey discloses software (18) coupled to server (14) which logs choices made by users (col. 3 lines 7-9). The motivation for doing so is listed in detail in col. 12, lines 1-19, and can be summarized as a means for facilitating television ratings and consumer research.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include in the system described by Matthews software coupled to said browser for reporting viewing choices made by a user. The reason for doing so would be to facilitate television ratings and consumer research.

Boyer discloses a web browser (Figure 2, browser 200, col. 2, lines 43-47), which also includes hypertext links, for displaying a web-transmitted guide (Figure 9, col. 5, lines 1-3, 21-27), allowing a user to access the guide using commonly available web browser software (col. 1, lines 65-67).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Matthews and Cathey to include a web

browser, a web-transmitted guide, and to display the hypertext link in the web browser, as taught by Boyer et al., for the advantage of allowing users to access the guide using commonly available web browser software.

In an analogous art, Stautner teaches receiving a particular program (tuning to the channel associated with a selected cell, col. 4, lines 54-60) upon selection of a program cell in an EPG (col. 4, lines 40-60).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclosed by Matthews, Cathey, and Boyer to include delivering television programming in response to said clicking of a particular program, as taught by Stautner. The reason for doing so is for the desired benefit of allowing a user to control the tuner of the system to tune directly to a chosen program by selecting it from the displayed EPG (Boyer, col. 5, lines 45-58).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12, 18, and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Legall et al. (6,005,565) and Legrand (6,020,930) who teach utilizing an on screen EPG to tune directly to a selected program.

Nguyen et al. (2002/0010932) and Schein et al. (6,263,501) who teach web based EPG's displayed in web browsers.

7. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____.
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) ____ - ____ on _____.
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dominic D Saltarelli whose telephone number is (703) 305-8660. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the primary examiner, Christopher Grant can be reached on (703) 305-4755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dominic Saltarelli
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2611

DS



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER